REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended herein. Therefore, claims 1-11 remain pending and under examination. No new matter is being presented, and reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has maintained the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 1-4, 6 and 9-11 as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. (U.S. 2004/0023685) (hereinafter "Nakamura") in view of Kawamura et al. (U.S. 2004/0198458) (hereinafter "Kawamura"). Dependent claims 5, 7 and 8 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Kawamura, and further in view of Kurashina et al. (U.S. Patent no. 5,947,619), Taniguchi et al. (U.S. 2004/0058715) and/or Okuzako et al. (U.S. 2004/0116167).

The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. The following is a comparison between embodiments of the present invention and the cited references.

In the Response to Arguments, on pages 2-3 of the Action, the Examiner states that Nakamura teaches a display control unit operable to determine whether a size of an image being displayed on the first display screen is larger than a size of the second display screen, citing paragraph [0107]-[0109]. In particular, the Examiner reasons that Nakamura discusses making a determination regarding whether to display an image in a first display or a second display, where the two displays are of different sizes. Thus, the teachings of Nakamura disclose that a size determination is made for the displayed image and adjusted accordingly.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Nakamura and embodiments of the present invention. Independent claim 1 recites a display control unit operable to read the data stored in the storage unit and display the data on the first display screen with a device main body in an opened state, read the same data and display the data on the second display screen (different in size than the first display screen) with the device main body in a closed state, and *determine whether a size of an image being displayed on the first display screen is larger than a*

size of the second display screen. If it is determined that the size of the image being displayed on the first display screen is less than or equal to the size of the second display screen, *no size-reduction processing is performed.*

Nakamura is directed to a foldable cellular phone with first and second displays 5 and 20 configured to display images, where the second display 20 is smaller than the first display 5. (Abstract and Figs. 2 and 3). The cited portions of Nakamura provide that image data in the shared memory may be enlarged to provide data for the first display 5 and reduced to provide data for the second display 20. (Paragraph [0107]). It is first determined (S3) whether the image is to be displayed on the first display 5 or the second display 20, based on the position of a selector button (*e.g.*, determining whether the phone is open or closed). When it is determined that the phone is closed, the second display 20 is selected, thereby displaying a reduced-sized image. (Paragraph [0108]).

Thus, according to Nakamura, when it is determined that the second, smaller display 20 is to be employed, the reduced image data is always used, which provides a smaller image as compared to the first display.

Nakamura is incapable of comparing the size of an image in the first display screen with the screen size of the second display screen and, if it is determined that the size of the image in the first display screen is less than or equal to the size of the second display screen, then maintaining the size of the image in the second display screen. In fact, Nakamura does not teach or suggest making an image size determination based on the size of the image and the size of the second display screen. Instead, the device of Nakamura always automatically reduces the image size, when the smaller display is employed.

Applicants further note that Kawamura is cited as disclosing displaying an image of equal size on two different display screens (citing Fig. 1, and paragraphs [0060], [0087] and [0091]). Kawamura discloses a video phone with a fixed display and a movable display part that can be opened to display another or the same image as is displayed in the fixed display. (See Figs. 1 and 2).

The fixed and movable displays of Kawamura are configured to display the same image, as described in paragraph [0060]. However, the fixed and movable displays of Kawamura are the *same size*. That is, Kawamura does not teach or suggest that if it is determined that the size of the image being displayed on the first display screen is less than or equal to the size of the second display screen, no size-reduction processing is performed, *where the first and second display screens differ in size*, as required by independent claim 1.

In addition, Applicants note that Nakamura is directed to a foldable cellular phone with first and second displays 5 and 20 configured to display images, where the second display 20 is smaller than the first display 5. Accordingly, the cellular phone of Nakamura is capable of reducing the size of an image to fit the smaller second display 20. Therefore, there would be no reason to combine the teachings of Kawamura, which merely describes the ability to display the same image on different displays of *equal size*. Thus, Applicants assert that the combination of these references is improper, as the Examiner has not cited a portion of Kawamura that is directed to maintaining an image size even when the sizes of the displays are different.

Even assuming *arguendo* that these references may be properly combined, neither Nakamura nor Kawamura, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests making an image size determination based on the size of the image and the size of the second display screen, and if it is determined that the size of the image being displayed on the first display screen is less than or equal to the size of the second display screen, no size-reduction processing is performed. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art, and should be immediately allowable.

Independent claims 9 and 10 recite features substantially similar to those described above, and therefore Applicants request that all pending independent claims are deemed allowable over the cited art for at least the foregoing reasons.

Regarding dependent claims 2-8 and 11, Applicants assert that none of the cited references (Kurashina et al., Taniguchi et al. and/or Okuzako et al.), alone or in combination, cures the deficiencies of Nakamura and Kawamura described above, and is not cited as disclosing the

aforementioned features. Therefore, the dependent claims should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons presented for independent claims 1, 9 and 10.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 278542014000. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: September 28, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

                                              By____/Michael Stanley/_____
                                              Michael Stanley
                                                 Registration No.: 58,523
                                              MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
                                              12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
                                              San Diego, California 92130-2040
                                              (858) 314-7795

sd-480113